



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,383	09/18/2000	Tomohiro Gomi	35.C14803	4743

5514 7590 07/27/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/664,383	Applicant(s) GOMI, TOMOHIRO	
	Examiner Thierry L. Pham	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-11,13-15,17,18,20,29,31,32,34,43,45,46 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-11,13-15,17,18,20,29,31,32,34,43,45,46 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/9/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: RCE filed on 6/9/06.
- IDS filed on 6/9/06 has been considered by the examiner and herein attached with Office Action.
- Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-15, 17-18, 20, 29, 31-32, 34, 43, 45-46, 48 are pending, wherein claims 2, 5, 12, 16, 19, 21-28, 30, 33, 35-42, 44, 47, 49-56 have been canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/9/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 15-18, 20, 29, 31-32, 34, 43, 45-46, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauronski et al (U.S. 5206735), and Davidson et al (U.S. 6025925), and further in view of Nukui et al (US 5239648).

Regarding claim 1, Gauronski discloses an information processing apparatus (scanner/controller, fig. 2) which can communicate with a printer (printer, fig. 2), comprising:

Art Unit: 2625

- a generation unit, adapted (scanner, fig. 2) for generating a print job (image files/print jobs, col. 3, lines 55-67 and col. 5, lines 18-50) to be processed by said printer, based on application data;
- an instruction unit, adapted (interrupt instructions for job interrupts, col. 6, lines 18-55 and col. 7, lines 4-22) for instructing any of the print jobs generated by said generation unit to be interrupt printed by the printer;
- a detection unit, adapted (controller, fig. 2) for receiving job information from the printer indicating that interrupt printing of the print job instructed by said instruction unit has failed (the interrupt job cannot be performed because parameters of interrupt print job are not available at the printer, col. 7, lines 29-36);
- notification means (display messages via user interface/display unit, figs. 1 & 5B, col. 7, lines 29-38) for causing the user that the instructed print job not been interrupt printed (a message indicates the interrupt jobs cannot be performed because parameters of interrupt print job are not available at the printer, col. 7, lines 29-36).

Gauronski fails to explicitly teach and/or suggest a job information status transmitted from the printer device that includes owner's identity of the print job (i.e. job owner's user id).

Davidson, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well known example of job information transmitted for the printer device which includes owner's identity of the print job (job status information from printer includes user's id, col. 2, line 55-60 and to determine which host computers are armed to receive Job Accounting Alert Data, col. 5, lines 33-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Gauronski to have job status information transmitted from printer to include owner's identity (i.e. job owner's user id) of the print job as per teachings of Davidson because of a following reason: (●) to easily identify who is the owner of the print job via using job owner user's id for the purpose of avoiding mixed up of plurality of print jobs.

Art Unit: 2625

The combinations of Gauronski and Davidson fail to teach and/or suggest determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus.

Nukui, in the same field of endeavor for information processing apparatus, teaches a well-known example of determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus (figs. 7-8, col. 3, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify information processing system of Gauronski and Davison to include a method and/or device for determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus for the purpose of displaying print job status information only to authorized users to prevent confidential documents that may be displayed to the wrong and/or unauthorized users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauronski and Davidson with Nukui to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, Gauronski further discloses an apparatus according to claim 2, wherein said notification unit causes said display unit to display an icon (col. 4, lines 5-16 and col. 7, lines 29-38) indicating that said print job has not been interrupt printed.

Regarding claim 4, Gauronski further discloses an apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said detection unit receives from said printer some information (a message indicates interrupt job is prohibited because lack of available parameters at the printer, col. 7, lines 29-38) indicating that said print job instructed by said instruction means to be interrupt printed has not been interrupt printed.

Regarding claim 6, Gauronski further discloses an apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said notification means notifies the user that said print job has not been interrupt printed but has been normally printed (interrupt job resumes, col. 6, lines 18-27 and col. 7, lines 4-60).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claims 15, 17-18, 20: Claims 15, 17-18, 20 are the methods corresponding the apparatus and recite limitations that are similar and in the same scope of invention as to those in claims 1, 3-4, 6 (respectively); therefore, claims 15, 17-18, 20 are rejected for the same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1, 3-4, 6 (respectively) above.

Regarding claims 29, 31-32, 34: Claims 29, 31-32, 34 correspond to claims 1, 3-4, 6 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus. All computers have some type of computer readable memory medium for storing computer programs, hence claims 29, 31-32, 34 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 1, 3-4, 6.

Regarding claims 43, 45-46, 48: Claims 43, 45-46, 48 correspond to claims 1, 3-4, 6 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus. All computers have some type of computer readable memory medium for storing computer programs, hence claims 43, 45-46, 48 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 1, 3-4, 6.

Claims 7, 9-11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida et al (U.S. 6130757) and Davidson et al (U.S. 6025925), and further in view of Nukui et al (US 5239648).

Regarding claim 7, Yoshida discloses a print controller (server apparatus/managing unit, col. 3, lines 1-17 and Abstract) which can process print jobs from a plurality of information processors (clients connecting via LAN network, col. 4, lines 17-30), comprising:

- an interrupt unit, adapted (print jobs with higher priority, abstract, col. 3, lines 1-17 and col. 18, lines 6-47) for suspending print operation for a print job and executing an interrupt print of another print job according to an instruction for interrupt print;

Art Unit: 2625

- a determination unit, adapted (CPU 103 of server apparatus, col. 18, lines 6-47) for determining whether a print job for the interrupt printing is currently present;
- a decision unit, adapted (CPU 103 of server apparatus, col. 18, lines 15-47) for, in response to reception of an interrupt-instructed print job from one of the plurality of information processing apparatuses, deciding (CPU 103 decides the priority of print job received from the clients, cols. 17-18) whether a received print job is interrupt printed (CPU 103 determines whether the interrupt job is printed or not, col. 18, lines 7-27), based on the determination result from said determination unit.
- a transferring unit, adapted for transferring (communication lines 7, fig. 1), to the one information processor, information indicating that the interrupt printing of the received print job has failed (processes and prints the current job if the interrupt job is not possible, col. 18, lines 13-20), wherein the one information processor (clients connecting via LAN network, col. 4, lines 17-30), causes a display unit to display that the print job has not been interrupt printed.

Yoshida fails to explicitly teach and/or suggest a job information status transmitted from the printer device that includes owner's identity of the print job (i.e. job owner's user id).

Davidson, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a well-known example of job information transmitted for the printer device which includes owner's identity of the print job (job status information from printer includes user's id, col. 2, line 55-60 and to determine which host computers are armed to receive Job Accounting Alert Data, col. 5, lines 33-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Yoshida to have job status information transmitted from printer to include owner's identity (i.e. job owner's user id) of the print job as per teachings of Davidson because of a following reason: (●) to easily identify who is the owner of the print job via using job owner user's id for the purpose of avoiding mixed up of plurality of print jobs.

Art Unit: 2625

The combinations of Yoshida and Davidson fail to teach and/or suggest determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus.

Nukui, in the same field of endeavor for information processing apparatus, teaches a well-known example of determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus (figs. 7-8, col. 3, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify information processing system of Yoshida and Davison to include a method and/or device for determining and comparing whether the owner of the print job is identical to a user of the information processing apparatus for the purpose of displaying print job status information only to authorized users to prevent confidential documents that may be displayed to the wrong and/or unauthorized users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yoshida and Davidson with Nukui to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Regarding claim 9, Yoshida further discloses a printer controller according to claim 7, wherein execution of multiple interrupts (multiple interrupts, figs. 10-11, col. 19, lines 34-39) means that an interrupt print is further executed while a previous interrupt print is being executed by said interrupt unit (interrupt prints with highest priority are being printed first, col. 18, lines 7-47).

Regarding claim 10, Yoshida further discloses a printer controller according to claim 7, wherein said print controller is a print controller for a printer (copy machines with printing function are connecting with server apparatus via LAN network, fig. 1, col. 4, lines 16-51 and col. 18, lines 8-47).

Regarding claim 11, Yoshida further discloses a printer controller according to claim 7, wherein said print controller is a print controller for a device having a copy

Art Unit: 2625

function (copy machine connects with server apparatus via LAN network, fig. 1, col. 4, lines 16-51 and col. 18, lines 8-47).

Regarding claim 13, Yoshida further discloses a printer controller according to claim 7, wherein a received print job is processed in normal order if it is decided that said received print job is not interrupt printed (continues to process and print the current job if the interrupt job is not possible, col. 18, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 14, Yoshida further discloses the controller according to claim 13, further comprising transfer unit adapted for transferring to an information processing apparatus some information (printing statuses, figs. 10-11, col. 11, lines 10-46) indicating that a received print job is processed in normal order (processes and prints the current job if the interrupt job is not possible, col. 18, lines 13-20) if it is decided that said received print job is not interrupt printed.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida, Davidson, and Nukui as described in claim 7 above, and further in view of Gauronski (U.S. 5206735).

Regarding claim 8, combinations of Yoshida, Davidson, and Gauronski do not explicitly disclose a controller further comprising prohibition means for prohibiting multiple interrupts, wherein said decision means decides that a received print job is not interrupted print if multiple interrupts are prohibited by said prohibition means.

Gauronski, in the same field of endeavor for interrupt prints, teaches a controller further comprising prohibition means for prohibiting multiple interrupts (multiple interrupts are prohibited/restricted, col. 7, lines 38-60), wherein said decision means decides that a received print job is not interrupted print (the next interrupt print job is restricted such that it will be placed in print queue immediately after the previously programmed interrupt job, col. 7, lines 38-67) if multiple interrupts are prohibited by said prohibition means.

Art Unit: 2625

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Yoshida, Davidson and Nukui as per teachings of Gauronski because of a following reason: (●) allowing the first interrupt job to be completed before printing the next interrupt job; therefore, improving operating efficiency of the interrupt printing system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yoshida, Davidson, and Nukui with Gauronski to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-13, filed 6/9/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 & 7 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thierry L. Pham



GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER